

The Examiner has taken the position that this application discloses several distinct species and has required Applicants to elect a single species for further examination at this time.

He has identified these species as: a) the rods of figure 1; b) the hubs of figures 1 - 3; c) the hub of figure 5 and d) the block of figure 4.

Applicants elect for further prosecution at this time, the species of the invention directed to the hubs of figures 1 - 3. This has been identified by the Examiner as species b.

It is believed that claims 1, 4 and 5, which are the only claims remaining in the application, read on the elected species. It is further believed that these claims distinguish over all prior art known to Applicants and that the claims should, therefore, be allowed.

Although Applicants had canceled original claim 3 and, therefore, no longer include any claims directed toward the non-elected species, this was done merely to advance the prosecution of this application. Applicants do not intend to abandon their rights to the non-elective species and reserve their right to file divisional applications at a later time.

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC CLEVER ET AL.

By:

Norman E. Lehrer
Registration No. 26,561

Dated: May 13, 1999